

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_114894</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact Assessment and Upliftment of Poor and Marginal Tribal Farmers of CG State through Quality Seed Production in Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.)</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Sufficient</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Needs a limitations sub-section after Conclusions. Their Conclusions are a bit overstated and literally a lead, though their methods seem solid.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>There few if any citations throughout the manuscript. The manuscript lacks scholarship. A list of references at the end of a manuscript is insufficient.</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript needs copy-edit assistance preferably from an outside service that specializes in English and technical / scientific manuscripts. The Intro has a plethora of declaratory / factual statements (indeed the authors state so in the last paragraph), yet there is no citations / references, for example: Intro, Par 1, Sens 1-8, Par 2, sen 1-8 and 10-11, and Par 3 sen 1-2. That's for starters.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, please see previous.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A scientific article is written for a general audience. This looks like a program evaluation that was hodgepodge-d out sensibly into a scientific article. The authors take it for granted that the uninformed reader already knows the subject matter and the area of the world. That's a dead giveaway this was originally an internal Program Evaluation report. So needs some significant re-write.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ralph J. Johnson</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UT-MDACC, USA</b>